

Claims 1, 2, 4, and 6 – 17 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Newman (U.S. Patent 6,377,189), and Claims 3, 5, 18 and 19 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Newman (6,377,189).

The applicant disagrees with each line item of the rejection partially due to a fundamental difference between the current application and Newman's patent 6,377,189. The '189 patent discloses a system where a computer (or memory 48 col. 5, line 20) at the well site collects and stores work-related data plus a well site identifier. Figure 6 of the patent shows how the data collected at the well site can be exported to a second computer 81, which simply stores the data in the form of a work history 81. The '189 patent claims a "communication link" that is between elements at the well site itself. The applicant fails to see where the patent discloses any data being transferred from an offsite location to a well site.

In contrast, the current application discloses and claims how someone at a remote well site can access a well file that is stored at an offsite location. So, if a worker at the well site needs information about the well, he can get that information from an offsite computer. In this application, the claimed communication link is between a first computer at the well site and a second computer at the offsite location.

The applicant has been unable to find where the Newman patent discloses a wireless communication link between a computer at a well site and another computer at an offsite location. The applicant is also unable to find where the Newman patent discloses a well file being transferred from an offsite computer to a computer at the well site.

Regarding the rejection of claims 18 and 19, the examiner states that it would be obvious to have multiple contractors performing the work, and the applicant agrees with that. In claim 19, however, the applicant basically claims the step of documenting "who did what" with respect to work that alters a well file. And in claim 18, the applicant basically claims documenting who witnessed the work. These steps provide considerable value, which has been overlooked in the Newman patent.

Consequently, the applicant requests the examiner reconsider his rejection and allow claims 1 – 19 in the present application or concede that the claims belong in a reissue application of the Newman patent.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert J. Harter (Reg. 32,031)
Patent Agent for Applicant
608-788-2778